UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/665,323 | 09/18/2003 | David J. Payne | 08049.0933 | 6243 | |
| | 7590 06/23/200 ENDERSON, FARAE | EXAMINER | | | |
| LLP | | | JOSEPH, TONYA S | | |
| 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 3628 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 06/23/2008 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 10/665,323 | PAYNE ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| TONYA JOSEPH | 3628 | |

| | TONYA JOSEPH | 3628 | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress | | |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>22 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | which places the r (3) a Request | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i) | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejection | on. | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ension and the corresponding amount of thortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beth appeal; and/or | nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); | ΓE below); | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: | | | | | |
| 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all | See Continuation Sheet. | | , | | |
| non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | l be entered and an e | xplanation of | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1. 4-13. 16-25. 28-37 and 40-56. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). | | | | | |
| 10. | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | |
| 12. | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | |
| /JOHN W HAYES/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628 | Tonya Joseph Examiner Art Unit: 3628 | | | | |

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Objection to the specification and 112 first paragraph-(new matter) rejection.

Continuation of 11. Applicant argues that claim 1 does not repeat the address correction process for any subsequent mail pieces. Examiner disagrees. As is consistent with Applicant's para. 28, the rejection asserts that comparing a second instance of a previously resolved and stored address is merely a repetitive step of verifying the same address, a step taught by Allen. Allen teaches comparing the incorrect address to the stored resolved address to determine that the incorrect address matches the first stored instance of the incorrect address (see Col. 15 lines 63-68 and Col. 16 lines 1-3). Applicant further asserts that the "receiving" and "comparing" steps ultimately lead to a "determination" that allows for the outputting of the correct address. Allen also teaches these steps; (see the Final Office Action" pg. 4). Although Allen lacks an explicit teaching of a "second instance", the methods are the same in that a previously resolved and stored address is relied upon to remedy any subsequent occurences of the incorrect address. Accordingly, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive and the rejection stands. All similar and dependent claims are rejected at least for the reasons stated above.